

NEW YORK JOURNAL
AND ADVERTISER.

W. R. HEARST.

AN AMERICAN PAPER FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PROGRESS
OF THE
CAMPAIGN.

It is apparent to every intelligent observer that the political canvass in this State has followed its own course rather than that marked out for it by the managers of the contending parties.

The Democratic leaders decreed that national issues should be ignored, but national issues persist in pushing themselves to the front nevertheless. The people decline to lose interest in the results of the war, for example, or to close their eyes to the fact that a Senator and Representatives are to be elected next month and a President two years hence.

Mr. Platt, poignantly conscious of the Republican record, issued the order that national issues only must be discussed. The people, however, refuse to be oblivious of the canal scandal, the Raines law, Tillamuth, the Force law, with its product of revolvers, clubs, domiciliary visits and re-introduction of the Davenport regime.

All this is embarrassing for the leaders, who are prone to forget that the people can think and have common sense and courage enough to face realities.

Mr. Roosevelt is wiser than Mr. Platt. The latter's confidence in the power of the machine causes him to be indifferent to public opinion and criticism, but the Republican candidate is still in touch with the actual world in which he lives and from which votes must be had. He has bucked Mr. Platt from the saddle to the extent of insisting on making speeches that mean something and which take cognizance of State affairs. Both Mr. Roosevelt and the State are to be congratulated on his rebellion.

Judge Van Wyck has been largely instrumental, no doubt, in compelling Mr. Roosevelt to abandon the Boss's plan of campaign. The Democratic candidate's fire on the targets erected at Albany by the Mack administration has been hot, accurate and very telling. And when his rival warms up to his work he will to a certainty cut out some for Van Wyck. Since Roosevelt's hand has been forced on State issues, it is only reasonable to presume that he will do his best to force his competitor's hand on national questions.

Democrats whose interest in politics is not bounded by State lines will be glad to see Judge Van Wyck stepping forward to meet every challenge issued by Mr. Roosevelt. The latter's strong hold is the war, in which he personally won distinction. But the candidate is more fortunate than his party, which was driven by the Democratic press and the Democrats in Congress into the conflict for the liberation of Cuba. The great triumphs of the struggle were won by the navy, in which there is no politics—and in which there has been no Algerism. The party that brought on the war can well afford to discuss the consequences of the war, good and bad, and no Jeffersonian Democrat can be hostile to national expansion.

The campaign is going on all right. It is broadening and gathering enthusiasm, and there is every reason to believe that a triumph awaits true Democracy.

MR.
M'KINLEY'S
PROGRESS.

At Terre Haute, Indiana, on Saturday, President McKinley, in one of the little speeches which he has been delivering for the good of his imperilled party, said:

The people of the United States want the victories of the army and of the navy to be recognized in the treaty of peace. It means that they want those of us who are charged with the administration of the Government to see to it that the war was not in vain, and that the just fruits of our achievements on land and sea shall not be lost.

That is right, but it is to be regretted that it has taken Mr. McKinley so long to wake up to the truth. The Journal apprised him of it months ago.

When the President was testing public opinion by feebly proposing that we retain only a coaling station at Manila the Journal informed him that the American people would be content with nothing short of the utter expulsion of Spain.

When the President reluctantly progressed to the point of letting it be known that he might favor the retention of Luzon and join with the beaten monarchy in governing the remainder of the Philippines, the Journal told him that the American people would never consent to any partnership with Spain.

It is by unwillingness that Mr. McKinley has come up with the people. If he had in August last occupied the ground he now holds there would have been no Peace Commission sitting in Paris. He would have notified Spain that if she wanted peace she might come to Washington and sue for it. He would have conveyed to her with frank firmness the information, which he now lets out in belated

BISHOPS ON DIVORCE. THEY DISCUSS THE PROPOSED CANON FOR THE JOURNAL.

FOR the past week a convention of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been discussing, in secret, the advisability of establishing a canon prohibiting the remarriage of divorced people, no matter for what cause the divorce was granted. Here are the views of some of the bishops on this subject:

Bishop Atwell—I favor the proposed modification of the existing canon relating to marriage and divorce inasmuch as it renders the interpretation of the canon clearer and gives to the Bishop some discretionary powers in regard to the penalty—that is, to the administering of the sacrament. But I do not accept section 3 of the report submitted by the Joint Committee on Revision of the Canons, which says: "No minister of this Church shall solemnize the marriage of either party to a divorce during the lifetime of the other party."

While I am unalterably opposed to divorce, except on the ground of adultery, I do not think that the innocent party should be made to suffer. The innocent party should be permitted to marry, and the Bishop, in my opinion, in a case where there might exist a doubt, should be permitted to exercise his own judgment in administering the sacrament. In other words, the Bishop should not be bound by the canon to inflict the penalty unless his mind was clear that the sacrament should not be administered.

I believe that the existing canon should be made more binding; that it should be rendered less liable to misinterpretation, and that the innocent should not be punished by the guilty.

Bishop Johnson—I favor a stricter canon on the subject of divorce and remarriage. The canon which exists should be made clearer, that it shall not be misinterpreted, and that it may have greater force in putting an end to that great evil which is undermining society.

The penalty of denying the sacrament is severe in many cases, but it is better that individuals should suffer than that society should be honeycombed with evil. There is but one cause for divorce, and while the guilty one should be punished, the other, whose innocence is clearly established, should be permitted to marry.

The revised canon is now being formulated and has not been passed by the House of Bishops. After it has been considered there it will pass over to the

House of Delegates for concurrence. I think in four or five days the question will be settled and the papers will know all that we have done.

Bishop Barker, of New Jersey—It would neither be proper nor decorous for me to discuss a question pending before the House of Bishops. I have no objection, however, to giving my personal opinion, which is that the marriage tie is indissoluble. By that, however, I do not mean that a person once married shall always live married. The question is one full of difficulty, among which is that the civil law differs in different States, and it appears that the civil law and the church law are in some cases irreconcilable. The State has the right to make its own laws, and that law must be paramount in that State. Members of the church, however, can be bound by the laws of their church, and in that way, perhaps, the question is one of personal acceptance and solution.

Bishop Whitehead, of Pittsburgh—My opinion is that there is only one lawful cause for divorce, and that is adultery. Persons who have been divorced ought not to be allowed to marry again. I think the solution of the problem would be the passage of a uniform law by the Congress of the United States. I think it is the view of all the bishops that the Government should take the whole matter in hand and pass a law on this very important subject.

Bishop Williams, of Michigan—As the youngest bishop, perhaps, in the house, I hesitate to give my views. I shall accept the law as it shall be made by this convention. I have never expressed an opinion on the question before the convention. One of the interesting questions, however, involved is whether the Bishop has the right, after divorce, to go behind the returns and determine who is the innocent party. I have always held that the Bishop has no such right. I think that the movers of this change are as desirous of determining this right of the Bishops, so as to remove all ambiguity in the law, as they are of changing the canon.

Bishop McKim, of Japan—I am distinctly not in favor of allowing marriage after divorce. At the same time I should not vote for a canon, the effect of which would be to discipline those who, under the laws of any State, have married after divorce. The present law has allowed a clergyman of the Episcopal Church to solemnize a marriage, one of the parties to which is a divorced person.



Tom the Bronco Buster: "Well, Who'd a-Thought It?"

driblets, that "the just fruits of our achievements on land and sea shall not be lost."

Instead of doing that, President McKinley paltered with a situation which had no natural difficulties, gave Spain reason to cherish the illusive hope that she might regain through diplomacy some of the territory she had forfeited in war, kept the Philippines in a turmoil, and spread astonishment and indignation through his own country by his strange exhibition of irresolution.

Mr. McKinley has heard from the people. He has felt the public pulse. He has arrived at the stand which the Journal took from the first—the Democratic stand that "the victories of the army and of the navy shall be recognized in the treaty of peace."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT has talents and qualities which give him conspicuousness and win him admirers, but he is not fated to be Governor of New York. That honor is reserved for Augustus A. Van Wyck.

THE RIGHT
KIND OF
DEMOCRACY.

The Hon. William Sulzer, candidate for re-election to Congress from the Eleventh District, is a Democrat who has no fear of national issues. Here is part of his platform:

This Government should hold the Philippines. The Journal puts it well when it says: "What American arms have won American statesmanship must hold." It would be a mockery and a hideous cruelty to the islanders to turn them over to the blood-wringing oppressions of a decayed monarchy. The islands must be under the care and protection of the United States, or this country is in duty bound, in the interests of humanity, in response to popular feeling, to establish a republic there. If the inhabitants are unfit for self-government now it is because they have been the serfs of a heartless and debasing government for 300 years. American spirit and institutions will soon effect a marvellous change.

That is Americanism. And being Americanism, it is Democracy of the Jeffersonian kind.

HEARTLESS, BUT SURE CURE
FOR POVERTY.

ing! All the new schools are teaching these doctrines. The next generation will begin to look at these things as they should be looked at."

"And then?"

"And then, in time, there will be no more want."

"And no more doctors?"

"The enthusiastic young physician hesitated."

"We'll," he said.

All these interesting things happened on Wednesday, October 12.

On Saturday, October 15, I read in the papers that one John Arheim, aged sixteen, had died of inanition.

He was looking for work and could find none.

So he died for want of food.

The people who knew him said he was a good boy and an intelligent one.

His old mother is going to the island, to the almshouse now.

She is a little upset by his sudden death, and the authorities will have more trouble in getting her to leave the attic where she has been living.

"Johnnie has gone to look for work," she says, "he will be worried if he comes home and finds me gone. When he gets work we're going to have a birth festival with the schufel and the dumplings I learned to make at home in Germany. Johnnie does not eat much now. He says he's waiting for the birth feast. He must not come and find me gone. He always whistles to me when he comes up the stairs. He is always singing and whistling. It will drive the bad luck from my thoughts, he says. Johnnie is a good boy—he will find work today, and I must be here to meet him when he comes."

So the little woman and the enthusiastic young physician have had their way.

One of the unfit has been eliminated.

But if I were either of them I should be very glad that I did not have to see the bewildered misery of that friendless old woman when the authorities take her away from "Johnnie's room" to the island.

The lower classes are so distressingly emotional.

A STRAW.

"I didn't know until yesterday that Bickerman was a candidate for office."

"Is he a candidate? This is the first I've heard of it."

"He must be, I saw him at the County Treasurer's office, paying his taxes, and he wasn't making any kind of a kick about it."—Cleveland Leader.

THE
DIVORCE
PROBLEM.

The interest of the country is given to the deliberations of the Episcopal bishops in convention at Washington who are dealing with the subject of divorce. The existing canon of the church which they represent permits the remarriage of the innocent party. It is proposed to substitute for this canon one forbidding either party to enter again the state of matrimony.

While it is true that the laws of the Episcopal Church are binding only on those who voluntarily acknowledge their authority, it would be a mistake to undervalue the influence of the canons of so numerous and respectable a body. Though the courts do not enforce its enactments, they carry a great social weight.

The modern tendency is to view marriage not as a sacrament, but as a civil contract simply, and in most of our States divorce is granted for a number of grounds other than the Scriptural one. Legislation is public opinion crystallized. To men and women who are not in the church it seems right that there should be a way of escape for those who have made the mistake of choosing the wrong conjugal partner. To their thinking divorce is not so much an evil as a cure for an evil.

From the Roman Catholic Church, which sets its face sternly against divorce altogether, down through the various denominations, all more liberal, the religious bodies act as a conservative force in checking the tendency to a freedom that would result in the marriage tie binding very lightly indeed.

It is well that the Episcopal Church should re-examine its ground and decide whether it shall do more than it now does to keep alive a sense of the sacredness of the marriage bond. But in this country, whatever may be the position of the churches, it is the average lay judgment—which finds expression in law—that if too easy divorce is bad, it is worse that men and women should be forced to live together when hatred has taken the place of love. With enough legal and social deterrents to prevent impulsive separations, but release for those whose lives would otherwise be wretched—that, right or wrong, is the accepted American rule. States which are severe are offset by States which go to the other extreme. The average is maintained in practice.

THE
MOHEGAN
HORROR.

It will take an official inquiry to fix the responsibility for the wreck of the Mohegan. The vessel struck on what is known as the Manacles, about twenty-five miles east of Land's End, and sank within five minutes, over one hundred of her passengers and crew perishing.

Although the night was clear and the shore visible, there was no warning. The vessel was out of her course, and the officers were evidently ignorant of her perilous situation.

Those whose negligence caused this terrible disaster went down with the ship. The captain stood at his post giving orders looking to the clearing of the life boats and the rescue of the passengers.

The action of the crew was in striking contrast to the conduct of the cowards that manned the Bourgogne. They obeyed orders implicitly, made no attempt to crowd into the boats, and rendered every assistance possible to the panic-stricken passengers.

The terror of the women and children was pitiful. Their shrieks of anguish could be heard on the shore. It was one of the worst of ocean disasters. Out of 154 people, comprising passengers and crew, not more than fifty were saved.

A
NAVAL
PROGRAMME.

Secretary Long, with wise forethought, has designated Commodore Higginson to formulate a definite programme of naval construction for the United States. The haphazard methods of the past have given us a collection of fine single ships, but no harmonious development. As we are now to take our place among the great naval powers of the world, this slipshod method of progress will no longer serve our turn. We must enlarge our navy on scientific lines, strengthen the weak places, and make the whole force symmetrically efficient.

One of the plans proposed is that within the next ten years we shall build sixteen battle ships, twenty-five armored cruisers and one hundred torpedo boats. That would involve the authorization of about three battle ships and five armored cruisers every two years and ten torpedo boats a year. Of course any such programme could be only tentative. It would be adopted, subject to change to meet the progress of invention. The battle ship may be entirely superseded in ten years from now. The surface torpedo boat almost certainly will be. The submarine boat and the alrship may dominate the seas. But if we lay out our plans under expert guidance we shall be able to make the necessary modifications intelligently instead of going at them blindly, as we do when Congress insists on doing everything by its unassisted wisdom.

ELIMINATION OF THE UNFIT,

MET a woman I know in the Broadway car last Wednesday. She's a good little woman and a cheery little woman, but that day she was pale and preoccupied.

We talked about the weather and the Summer that is past, and about Cyrano and his nose, and Glory and her parson, and then she said:

"I wish I was a good deal worse than I am or else a good deal better. I'm having about the worst time just now. There's a half grown boy that haunts our street looking for work. I've nothing for him to do. No one seems to have anything for him, and this morning I saw him stagger and sit down on my very steps, and I knew he was hungry—and he has such big, helpless eyes and such a pitiful, puzzled kind of look—I had all I could do to keep from running out and giving him something to eat and some decent shoes for his poor tired feet and some money to begin again with."

"Why didn't you do it?" I said. The little woman's eyes grew big. "Why," she said, "it wouldn't be right. I would be encouraging pauperism. The survival of the fittest, you know. No, I mean the elimination of the unfit, that's it; that's what my husband says. It's the elimination of the unfit—I mustn't interrupt it. You see, that poor boy is unfit, and he ought to be eliminated, but his face has haunted me all day."

And then she stopped the car to go into a big department store to a bargain sale, where unfit articles of wearing apparel were to be eliminated "this day only" at amazing reductions in prices.

That elimination of the unfit doctrine is beginning to percolate. For a long time it has been the sole property of the social ethics fanatics. Now the doctors are taking it up, and you can't read a report of a physician's society in session without seeing a dozen eulogistic references to the glorious and humane doctrine of the elimination of the unfit.

Dr. Cyrus Edson said some very interesting things about that same doctrine in

print the other day. He doesn't seem to take much stock in it. I went to see a physician who does take stock in it and asked him to tell me all about it.

He was delighted.

"Why," he said, "it's so simple. That's the beauty of it. You see, we want to evolve along the lines of perfection."

"Now, that boy your friend was worried about; he can't be perfect, and if he's helped to grow up and get married his children will be more unfit than he is."

"So, you see, we must eliminate him and all his kind."

"To do that we must do entirely away with the free hospital idea. That's a curse. So is the free dispensary. Any of the new school of doctors will tell you that."

"Those institutions help the unfit to survive. A man who can't afford to pay for hospital service is not worth worry. Do you catch the idea?"

"Same about schools. This public school business is all wrong."

"If a man can't afford to pay for his children's schooling, those children ought not to go to school. Why should the Government give every man and woman a free education any more than it should give them a free suit of clothes?"

"Charities? All wrong—all terribly wrong. Organized charity is the worst of all. That puts a respectable face on what is really a very disgraceful thing. That woman of yours in the car is primitive yet, but, you see, she's learning."

"A few years ago nearly every one would have felt as she did about that boy; but now people are learning—learning rapidly. The public schools stand most in the way of real growth. They keep educating the unfit—and the more the unfit are educated the worse they get."

"Same in medicine. It's all wrong, keeping sickly people alive the way we do! All wrong! The day will come—and come soon—when real humanity will be shown by the doctors, and the weak and diseased will die—as they ought to die."

"The world's growing—the world's grow-

ing! All the new schools are teaching these doctrines. The next generation will begin to look at these things as they should be looked at."

"And then?"

"And then, in time, there will be no more want."

"And no more doctors?"

"The enthusiastic young physician hesitated."

"We'll," he said.

All these interesting things happened on Wednesday, October 12.

On Saturday, October 15, I read in the papers that one John Arheim, aged sixteen, had died of inanition.

He was looking for work and could find none.

So he died for want of food.

The people who knew him said he was a good boy and an intelligent one.

His old mother is going to the island, to the almshouse now.

She is a little upset by his sudden death, and the authorities will have more trouble in getting her to leave the attic where she has been living.

"Johnnie has gone to look for work," she says, "he will be worried if he comes home and finds me gone. When he gets work we're going to have a birth festival with the schufel and the dumplings I learned to make at home in Germany. Johnnie does not eat much now. He says he's waiting for the birth feast. He must not come and find me gone. He always whistles to me when he comes up the stairs. He is always singing and whistling. It will drive the bad luck from my thoughts, he says. Johnnie is a good boy—he will find work today, and I must be here to meet him when he comes."

So the little woman and the enthusiastic young physician have had their way.

One of the unfit has been eliminated.

But if I were either of them I should be very glad that I did not have to see the bewildered misery of that friendless old woman when the authorities take her away from "Johnnie's room" to the island.

The lower classes are so distressingly emotional.

"I didn't know until yesterday that Bickerman was a candidate for office."

"Is he a candidate? This is the first I've heard of it."

"He must be, I saw him at the County Treasurer's office, paying his taxes, and he wasn't making any kind of a kick about it."—Cleveland Leader.

AMONG EXCLUSIVES. CHOLLY KNICKERBOCKER'S GOS-SIP OF SOCIETY.

NEWS comes from abroad that Mrs. John W. Mackay has returned to London and reopened her house in Carlton Terrace.

She has been passing the late Summer months at her place in Kent, where she had with her her daughter, the Princess Colonna Galatro, and the latter's children. The Princess has gone to Italy, where, under the terms of her separation from her husband, she must pass six months of each year.

Mrs. Mackay will go to Paris to-morrow to attend a requiem mass at the Madeleine, which she has ordered to be celebrated for her son, Willie Mackay, whose tragic death in France is familiar to all.

Mrs. Mackay is devoted to the memory of her boy, and brings to the repose of his soul all the resources of the church to which she belongs.

Mr. and Mrs. William Easy Dollar Stokes are among the people who expect to live in new houses this Winter. Mr. Stokes has caused to be builded a handsome five-story residence at No. 4 East Fifty-fourth street. It backs on the Fifth avenue house of Levi P. Morton, and is much in the same style, with colonial basement and Indiana limestone as the material.

Mr. and Mrs. Stokes expected to occupy their new house not later than January 15. They both disclaim that the Fifty-fourth street place is to be in any sense a palace, and yet it is 35 feet by 100 feet, and has in it a Louis XV. salon that is 35 feet by 30 feet, and adjoining a marble hall that is separated only by a movable partition so that in the case of a ball the two may be thrown into one.

The dining room and conservatory are also on a large scale, and altogether the new Stokes house is one that is adaptable to extensive entertainments.

Mr. William Easy Dollar Stokes gets his sobriquet from the fact that he has made so much money and made it so quickly. It is estimated by people who make it their business of estimating other people's property that Mr. Stokes now owns seventy houses on the upper West Side, that none of these rents for less than \$2,000 per annum and that only two of them are now untenanted.

From this source alone therefore Mr. Stokes derives an income of \$140,000 a year, to say nothing of other successful business ventures and land speculations, including a cemetery at Mount Kisco.

It is said that the latter is also becoming rapidly tenanted, and so it will be seen without further discussion why the chaplains refer to the distinguished friend of the

brother of the uncle of the Czar of Russia as Mr. William Easy Dollar Stokes.

George Eustis, of the Meadowbrook contingent, has good reason to remember the war with Spain. He was at Santiago during the bombardment, and was so close to the guns that his hearing was almost entirely destroyed.

He has just taken possession of his new home at Hempstead, which was built to replace the one burned down last Spring.

While George Eustis has lost his hearing he still retains his nerve, and will play polo this Spring with the same vim and dash that he fought the Spaniards.

Other gossip from the Long Island contingent furnishes the information that Mr. and Mrs. Belmont Tiffany are contemplating a trip to Europe next Spring, but will pass this Fall and Winter in the Frothingham cottage, at Cedarhurst.

Belmont Tiffany has been very low spirited ever since the death of his brother, Willie, who fought with the Rough Riders and contracted a fatal fever in Cuba.

Meadowbrook is signaling for that most charming of widows, Mrs. Adolph Ladenburg, who is just now away at Beverly Farms, Massachusetts, and is distinguishing herself as usual by riding her famous hunter, The Dutchman, to hounds with the Myoplas.

If Mrs. Ladenburg doesn't leave Beverly Farms very soon and come back to Meadowbrook somebody will leave Meadowbrook and go to Beverly Farms.

Oliver Belmont, at the instigation of his ever progressive wife, has temporarily abandoned politics and gone in for horse improvements at his Long Island place. He has applied for permission to the Highway Commission of Hempstead to build a bridge over Meadow Brook, and has promised, if such permission be given him, to cause to be erected a drinking fountain for man and beast.

Oliver never did believe in thirst, and in all probability his generous offer will be accepted by the appreciative Highway Commissioners of Hempstead.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence H. Mackay seem to have contracted the prevalent habit of setting up a number of establishments.

They have just leased for three years the J. F. D. Lanier place, which was occupied for a while by William C. Whitney at Westbury, L. I. They have also taken Mrs. Richard Irelia's town house, at No. 12 West Thirty-sixth street, and are at present occupying the Perry Tiffany cottage on Long Island.

It was according to the last news. It may be by this time that Mr. Mackay has secured a few more houses for himself and his bride.

CHOLLY KNICKERBOCKER.